

NEW-YORK, SUNDAY, FEBRUARY 11, 1912.

Mayor Lunn Asserts That Socialism Stands for Basic Justice

Schenectady's Executive, Replying to Dr. Pallen, Quotes Various Men of Note.

This is the third in a series of articles in the Tribune discussing socialism. The first article, in favor of socialism, by John D. McMahon was published January 14. It was answered by Dr. Conde B. Pallen, editor of "The Catholic Encyclopedia," on January 28.

By the Rev. Dr. George R. Lunn, Mayor of Schenectady, N. Y.

DR. PALLER'S attempt to identify socialism with all the things that certain men who are socialists have believed is a piece of intellectual trickery which will do him no good. Does every Republican have to believe all that Roosevelt preaches? Because President Taft is a Unitarian does it follow that Cardinal Gibbons, who supports him, is a Unitarian, too? Because John D. Rockefeller is a Baptist are we to assume that the Baptists believe in everything that John D. Rockefeller does? Really, this attempt to make the socialist movement responsible for every word that socialists have written is nothing but an evasion of the fundamental tenet of all socialists—that the means of production and exchange should be owned by the whole people.

That question does not seem to interest Dr. Pallen. He is interested in the frightful results of "Economic Determinism." Let me state it: "In the whole course of ancient and modern history there is scarcely any single important political event that has not been caused, either directly or indirectly, by some economic influence. Religion and physical causes may also have been present, but the economic factor seems to have been the most constant and the most pervasive."

Before telling Dr. Pallen who wrote that excellent statement of economic determinism, let me repeat Dr. Pallen's own words in regard to it. In "The Common Cause" for February he writes: "Scientific socialism is rooted in economic determinism, and economic determinism denies God, religion, freedom and the home."

SOURCE OF THE DEFINITION.

New let me tell Dr. Pallen the name of the book from which I, as a socialist, have taken my definition of economic determinism. It is called "History of Economics; or, Economics as a Factor in the Making of History." It is written by the Rev. J. A. Fawcett, A. M., late professor of history in the College of St. Thomas, St. Paul; now professor of history at the University of Ottawa. The publishers are Benziger Brothers—"Printers to the Holy Apostolic See."

On the reverse of the title page Dr. Pallen will find this:

"Nilil Obstat, Remy Lafort, Censor Librorum—Imprimatur, John M. Farley, Archbishop of New York—New York, November 30, 1907—Copyright, 1908, by Benziger Brothers." This, translated into English, means that Cardinal Farley has no objection to the book from which I as a socialist have taken my doctrine of economic determinism.

We may leave Dr. Pallen and the Cardinal to settle this matter between them. On the one hand a book approved by the Cardinal; on the other hand Dr. Pallen's statement that the doctrine contained in the book the Cardinal approves denies "God, religion, freedom and the home."

If this doesn't convince Dr. Pallen as to the ease with which his favorite trick can be worked, nothing will. Personally, I despise this trick of digging around for quotations to trip up people. But it has been used against us socialists for so long a time that once in a while we may be forgiven for stooping to it ourselves. It's too easy.

HOLD NO BRIEF FOR SCIENCE.

Dr. Pallen attacks science in general and Darwinism in particular. It is not up to the socialists to defend science. It is a scientific curiosity that medieval minds should exist in the twentieth century. The learned doctor has an ecclesiastical horror of facing the facts of economic determinism, as earlier men regarded the theory of the descent of man. Instead of this ostrich attitude we should, frankly acknowledging the material foundations of society, resolve to make them decent. We have been largely controlled by the material; now let us control it. The materialists are those who allow present conditions to continue.

The surplus value theory is hardly vanquished by a tin-trousers theory. A way-faring man, though a fool, can figure out that value, or the making of wealth, is the product of human labor of hand and brain applied to nature's resources. Is there any other way by which houses, ships, railroads, clothes, foods and furniture are



THE REV. DR. GEORGE R. LUNN, SOCIALIST MAYOR OF SCHENECTADY, N. Y., AUTHOR OF THIS ARTICLE.

made? The capitalist as a capitalist makes nothing. The working class—including superintendents, brain workers, skilled directors of industry—make everything.

Dr. Pallen ignores the economic struggle in society. The sun does not shine for the blind, and nature has no sounds for the deaf. We may ignore that struggle—the greatest fact in history and modern society—but the struggle does not ignore us. Plutocracy and democracy are in irrepressible conflict.

Socialists paint things too black, according to Dr. Pallen. For the blackness of their painting the socialists are content to take the reports of the United States Census enumerators, the reports of the Charity Organization Society, the Pittsburgh Survey of the Sage Foundation and the reports of all other charitable institutions.

THE FAMILY AND SOCIALISM.

There is the charge of breaking up the home. Capitalism is doing that; we want to stop it. Poverty and disease are breaking up thousands of homes. We can hardly imagine that the family will suffer through the socialist programme of plenty and the economic independence of women. Against the views of the family and sex relations attributed to socialists, Senator Borah, Republican, remarked in the Senate recently that he would like to see American children as well cared for as are American pigs by the grace of the Agricultural Department.

Dr. Pallen seeks to warn the nation against the menace of socialism. If socialism is the menace which our distinguished writer imagines it to be, it is the duty of every lover of humanity to oppose its advance. Instead, however, of its being a menace, it is the only promise which appeals to the best heart and mind of the nation. Its tremendous growth is evidence that socialism stands for basic justice and fundamental righteousness, or else we are driven to the conclusion that its growth can be explained, as Dr. Pallen explains it, viz., a base desire and scramble for other men's possessions inspired by greed, envy, self-seeking, leveling down, hatred, etc.

It is not bread and butter that the socialists are panting for, but automobiles and champagne. It is not that they are thirsting merely for a strict equality in the distribution of the world's goods, but they are hungry for the largeness of luxury. Take away the Utopian vision of a life of ease and bounty from the average socialist and his enthusiasm will collapse like a punctured bladder.

It is plainly evident to the unprejudiced that the above statement could only come as a result of the punctured pride of Dr.

dried up every sentiment of sympathy, and sordid selfishness which is deaf to cries of distress. Their whole aim is to realize large dividends without regard to the claims of justice and charity. These trusts and monopolies, like the car of Juggernaut, crush every obstacle that stands in their way. They compel their operatives to work for starvation wages, especially in mining districts and factories, where protests are but a feeble effort and easily stifled by intimidation.

The "promise of ineffable felicity hereafter" for a life of rectitude here below has not been a sufficient deterrent to hinder Christian men, so called, from using the Moloch machine of capitalism to pile up immense fortunes by grinding dividends out of the very life of men, women and children. The men who are doing these things are not doing it because they are hard hearted above the rest of us. True, there are many individuals whose selfishness controls all other actions, but the cruelties of capitalism are not because of individuals, but because of the very working of capitalism.

Whatever capitalism has accomplished for the world, and it has accomplished some things, it has now outgrown its usefulness. It has developed the colossal machines of production called trusts, and it only remains for the people to decide whether these trusts shall be owned by a few men, who through industrial power will control government, or whether the people themselves shall take possession of the essential tools of production and exchange, on which all our lives are dependent. No one can deny the fact that the many are at the mercy of the few today. The many cannot work unless the few will give them the privilege.

The trusts will continue to own and operate the people until the people own and operate the trusts.

Human life depends upon food, shelter and clothing, and the men who control the machinery by which alone food, clothing and shelter can be supplied thereby control human life.

We cannot go back to the old days of competition, even to satisfy the desires of President Taft and his programme of dissolving the trusts. The formation of the



THE RIGHT REV. F. S. SPALDING, PROTESTANT EPISCOPAL BISHOP OF UTAH, AN ADVOCATE OF SOCIALISM.

and his type can make the most of it. But the limit of vituperation is reached when we socialists are accused of destroying religion. I am surprised that Dr. Pallen considers religion of such a fragile nature that any person or organization of persons can by any possible means destroy it. Cardinal O'Connell, of Boston, while he was archbishop, made a statement to the effect that socialism would destroy God and religion. This is attributing a supernatural power to socialism. Surely this is an unwarranted extension of the power of socialism.

I agree once more with the British Catholic leader Russell, who is very clear to state that he is not a socialist, when he says:

ATTITUDE TOWARD SOCIALISM.

"Socialism is denounced by many of our Catholic priests and Catholic laymen as something abominable which no Catholic can support or tolerate, and socialists are declared to be fools and knaves, and that is the attitude which I wish you to examine to-day. Again I repeat I am not a socialist, but I want to ask you whether this attitude toward socialism is either just or wise. Its definition is well known and admitted. It is a system under which the state is to own all the productive business and manufactures in a country, instead of their being owned, as at present, by a fortunate and favored section of the community. I strongly object and protest against socialism being fought upon wrong lines, and, to my mind, it is fighting it on wrong lines to denounce it on the ground of religion and morality."

"It is not only unfair fighting," continues Russell, "but like the rest of unfair fighting it is a very foolish procedure, because if all the forces of religion are turned against socialism it will inevitably follow, in course of time, that the forces of socialism will necessarily be turned against religion, whereas if socialism is met, as it ought to be met, and fought on the battleground of economic principles, we will then be meeting it and fighting it on a fair field with no favor."

I protest most strongly against the falsification of religious thunderbolts, even when they are delivered by our genial friend, Father Bernard Vaughan, from a select platform in the Queen's Hall, a duke in the chair and Rothschild's Band discoursing sweet music."

"Persuasion sometimes makes converts," denunciations never. Nothing you can say or do will prevent the mass of the nation listening to the teachings of socialism. The people know and feel the mortal disease from which they are suffering, and they will listen to all serious people who propose a remedy. They will listen, too, to

Says Family and Religion Would Thrive Better Under Co-operative Social Order.

you if you are prepared to show the fallacy of the remedy, but mere wholesale abuse and denunciation will merely make them turn away in disgust and drive them in the very direction from which you wish to divert them."

The Socialist party, as such, like every other political party, leaves the question of religion an individual matter. In the Socialist party, like the Republican party, are representatives of every shade of religious opinion. Socialism as the membership of the party proves, is not hostile to religion. It is capitalism which frustrates every attempt to lead a consistent religious life.

Capitalism, with its control of nature's resources and the products thereof, flourishing only as it applies the principle that its "sword knows no brother," is essentially contrary to the very spirit of all religion. At the Pan-Anglican Congress in London, referred to above, Mr. Masterman, Member of Parliament, discussing capital and labor, contended that it was impossible to moralize the new financial development, the concentration of capital, for "if business and commercial competition turn aside from its end in order to be influenced by moral considerations it must inevitably perish."

THE RIGHT AND THE WRONG.

We can easily see the extraordinary significance of that statement. Surely that distinguished clerical audience could detect the full meaning. Is it possible that moral considerations affect capital that way? And must they be withheld lest "business and commercial competition perish"? Can the ethically right be economically wrong? "It is necessary," continued Mr. Masterman, "to realize in the world of business, as on the battlefield, a world outside the direct control of the Christian ethic."

We socialists are grateful for this frank utterance by Mr. Masterman. It is simply in line with the statement of one of our great capitalists: "Business is war." It is hardly necessary to quote the well known words of General Sherman regarding war. The people are beginning to understand the anti-social, anti-religious, anti-ethical nature of capitalism and its power over the worker.

We socialists contend, however, that the condemnation of capitalism is not the equivalent of condemning capitalists as such. They are beneficiaries of our present pernicious system, while the workers are the victims. As feudalism grew out of a previous social order, so capitalism has succeeded feudalism, and the world now is in transition toward a new social order. Whatever the plutocracy may think, the great democracy is thinking of socialism as the hope of the world, and their regard for it amounts almost to religious devotion. The greatest sacrifices are made with joy in behalf of this supreme movement of the ages to emancipate the human race.

CRUDE AND BOLD.

"I knew the late Clark Russell well," said a Philadelphia shipping reporter. "The unhappy man, racked with rheumatism, lay for many years on his back as helpless as a newborn babe. That, perhaps, was how he came to leave \$100,000. He couldn't spend any of his money, you see."

"Authors make less than is supposed," Clark Russell was once talking to me about authors' earnings. He said that publishers exaggerated the earnings so as to get more people to write for them.

"He said that the millionaire publisher, in order to draw authors on, painted the prosperity of the successful writer with the bold, crude exaggeration wherewith the preacher in the mariners' bethel painted the horrors of the bad place."

"A bethel preacher, he explained, was describing the bad place to a congregation of shellbacks."

"Shipmates," he said, "you've seen the molten iron come running out of the furnace, haven't you? It comes out white hot, sizzling and hissing like some kind of snake, horrible monster. Well, shipmates—"

"The preacher pointed his forefinger at the awed shellbacks."

"Well, shipmates," he said solemnly, "they use that stuff for ice cream in hell."

A POOR PROMOTER.

The famous mining engineer, John Hays Hammond, said at a dinner in New York of a financier who had failed:

"No wonder he failed. His methods were inept. He was the sort of chap who'd start the promotion of a new gold mine by naming it the Munchausen-Cook."



EUGENE V. DEBS, THE LEADER OF AMERICAN SOCIALISTS.

Pallen, not as the result of economic erudition. It is a sorry day for our nation if the thousands of men and women who are flocking to the Socialist party are doing so inspired alone by a low and cruel cupid-ity. As a matter of fact just the opposite is true. Socialism is making its appeal to the highest instincts of the race. It demands the reconstruction of the industrial and social order. Not because it is covetous or greedy. That charge is absolutely false. The working class are simply demanding the prerogatives and equalities which rightly belong to human life. They see that the present conditions are founded not on moral principle, but on the domination of economic power. They see a pitiless system demanding for its perpetuation the best life of men, women and children. The workers know by painful experience that stern economic law of capitalism that the returns of labor tend to diminish steadily downward to the margin of mere existence.

We agree with Bishop Gore, when he says in a paper read at the Pan-Anglican Congress in London, that "the socialist movement is based upon a great demand for justice in human life. It notes the injustice in the actual division of the profits of industry, both present and inherited. There is nothing in the socialist idea of the construction of society which is antagonistic to Christianity; its main idea is closely allied to the Christian idea."

Let us face the facts. We are confronted not alone in America, but throughout the world, with deplorable and appalling social conditions. In America we have developed a plutocracy of concentrated wealth more foreboding than ever before known in the history of the world. As a result of plutocracy on the one side, we are developing a dire poverty on the other, threatening in its sinister aspect.

As Cardinal Gibbons once said: "No friend of his race can contemplate with- out painful emotions the heartless monopolists and grasping avarice which have

combine and the amalgamation of companies which mean monopoly cannot be hindered unless we turn economic evolution backward. The capitalist today is only powerful by combining with others. Co-operation in production is the underlying necessity of the trust. There is no moment in which "the capitalist is not relying upon the vast system of co-operating forces, on whose assistance he can confidently calculate and which his every need and wish have at their immediate command. His power assumes from first to last an immense world of co-operating forces, organized for his use and built up into an industrial and social body. Unless those forces were under him to buoy him up and to supply him with opportunities he would be impotent."

The day for our old hero, the self-made man, has passed away forever. He no longer has the opportunity. The Nebuchadnezzar spirit which says, "Is not this the great city and its trade which I have built by the might of my power?" is stunningly rebuked by modern facts. There is no place in the commercial process in which he can take his stand and declare, "Here I am alone. No other human being has part or lot with what I do. I am sole and independent. The cause, the force, the effect of this particular act are all my own and I am responsible to myself and no other." That position is impossible to-day for the individual capitalist. He can progress only so far as he utilizes the co-operative forces furnished him by his privileged position. And he can maintain this only as long as the nation assists him in those special privileges. The nation makes it possible for capital to continue to develop like a colossus, to tyrannize over labor, then the nation can and has the right to demand that the control through ownership be in its own hands.

Socialism would abolish the capitalist system with its whole retinue of social evils—the involuntary poverty of women and children doomed to an indus-

trial slavery in factories, mines and mills because the means of production and the instruments of distribution are principally owned by a plutocracy and operated for private profit instead of being owned by a democracy and operated for public use. We would transfer the colossal power of the capitalists into the hands of society. It is not money which we socialists desire to transfer, but power. It is no automobiles and champagne that we seek, as per the charges of Dr. Pallen, but autonomy and co-operation.

We do not seek to take away from any man of his type to which belongs to him, but we are determined to stop certain men from taking that which does not belong to them. We rebel against the system which involves a continual confiscation of private property.

We contend, and justly, that the product of a man's toil is his own private property, and a system which takes from the masses of the workers the larger portion of their earnings is a system vicious and founded on essential injustice.

It is well enough for Dr. Pallen and the men of his type to cry aloud against socialism, pick a flaw in this argument or that one; denounce the economic struggle, involving, as it does, the line-up of plutocracy on one side and the people on the other, but the fact remains that any organized determination to stop the process of fleecing by law the major portion of the earnings of workers under any other name than socialism would sound equally terrible. We would quote again from the speech of the British Catholic leader, the Hon. Charles Russell, when he says, "The burden is upon anybody who denounces socialism to suggest an alternative, but up to the present moment socialism alone holds the field."

Dr. Pallen is much concerned because socialism, to him, means anarchy. The outline of socialism, as I have stated it, is in accordance with the national principles and platform of the Socialist party of America. If this constitutes anarchy, Dr. Pallen



EMIL SEIDEL, SOCIALIST MAYOR OF MILWAUKEE.



THE REV. J. STITT WILSON, SOCIALIST MAYOR OF BERKELEY, CAL.